



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/010,536 | 12/05/2001 | Jason F. Hunzinger | 440402000400 | 2790 |

25224 7590 10/31/2002
MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP
555 WEST FIFTH STREET
SUITE 3500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013-1024

EXAMINER

SOBUTKA, PHILIP

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2683

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/010,536

Applicant(s)

HUNZINGER, JASON F.

Examiner

Philip J. Sobutka

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-10, 12-19, 21-23, 25-30, 32-34, 36, 38-43, 45-47, 50-57, 59-61, 63-68, 70-72 and 74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 11, 20, 24, 31, 35, 37, 44, 48, 49, 58, 62, 69, 73 and 75 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 April 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3, 9, 10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 12-16, 19, 21, 22, 25-27, 29, 30, 32-34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, 50-54, 57, 59, 60, 63-65, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bodin et al (US 5,301,356).

Consider claims 38,52,72,74. Bodin teaches a system comprising identifying a mobile station having potentially failing connection (i.e. in need of hand-off) (Bodin see especially col 3, lines 7-24), transmitting a rescue channel (Bodin see especially col 3, lines 31-35), monitoring reverse channels (Bodin see especially col 8, line 61 – col 9, line 24) the rescue channel including a synchronization message specific to the mobile (Bodin see especially col 6, lines 18-28), receiving the message at the mobile, and handing off the mobile in accordance with the handoff information (Bodin see especially fig 6). Note that the handoff would of course entail transmitting on the forward and reverse channel according to the handoff information, and that Bodin's mobile includes a control processor (boding see especially fig 2, item 130).

As to claims 1,12,14,25,32,34,36,50, the system of Bodin would perform the claimed steps.

As to claims 26,64,70,71, the mobile of Bodin would perform the claimed steps.

Art Unit: 2683

As to claims 2,15,39,53, note that Bodin teaches updating the rescue channels when calls are handed off (Bodin see especially col 9, line 59 – col 10, line 14).

As to claims 3,8,13,16,21,27,33,40,45,46,51,54,57,59,63,65,68, note that Bodin teaches using specific codes so that only the mobile having the code can successfully demodulate the channel (Bodin see especially col 6, lines 18-28).

As to claims 6, 9,19,29,43,67, note that Bodin would have a specific rescue channel for each mobile (Bodin see especially col 6, lines 18-28).

As to claims 22,60, note that Bodin teaches the use of TDMA that transmits separate messages in sequential time slots (Bodin see especially col 5, lines 19-36).

As to claim 30, note that communication is maintained till hand off is complete.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4,17,28,41,55,66, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of Gavrilovich (US 5,729,826).

Bodin teaches everything claims as shown above except for the coding being orthogonal codes. Gavrilovich teaches that orthogonal coding in a mobile system with 7 control bits and 9 identification bits allows for 3,854 unique identities (Gavrilovich col 8, lines 29-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify

Bodin to use the orthogonal coding of Gavrilovich allowing 7 control bits and 9 id bits to provide 3,854 unique identities.

5. Claims 5,18,42,56, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of Quick, Jr. (US 5,673,259).

Bodin teaches everything claims as shown above except for the code mask being generated using the channel number and local parameters. Quick teaches that the preferred method for generating the code mask is by using the channel number and local parameters (Quick see especially col 13, lines 8-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Bodin to generate masks as shown in the claims in order to use a well known and preferred technique as taught by Quick.

6. Claims 10,23,47,61, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of Raith et al (US 5,081,671).

Bodin teaches everything claims as shown above except for the rescue channels being reserved even when not needed. Raith teaches a rescue channel system in which certain numbers of channels are reserved even when not needed (Raith col 3, line 65 – col 4, line 9). Raith teaches that the reduced blockage is worth the sacrifice of capacity (Raith col 3, lines 20-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Bodin to reserve rescue channels in order to reduce call blocking as taught by Raith.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 7,11,20,24,31,35,37,44,48,49,58,62,69,73,75 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in

Art Unit: 2683

independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Girardeau et al (US 6,161,014) has been cited to show another rescue channel system.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Sobutka whose telephone number is 703-305-4825. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Philip Sobutka

Pjs
October 28, 2002


WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600